This document was prepared in conjunction with work accomplished under Contract No. DE-AC09-96SR18500 with the U. S. Department of Energy.

DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, nor any of their contractors, subcontractors or their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or any third party's use or the results of such use of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof or its contractors or subcontractors. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

Keywords:Aluminosilicate
Uranium
Plutonium

Retention: Permanent

TASK TECHNICAL AND QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN FOR THE 2H EVAPORATOR SCALE ANALYSIS

W. R Wilmarth C. E. Duffey

JUNE 30, 2005

Washington Savannah River Company Savannah River Site Aiken, SC 29808



DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared for the United States Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC09-96SR18500 and is an account of work performed under that contract. Neither the United States Department of Energy, nor WSRC, nor any of their employees makes any warranty, expressed or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for accuracy, completeness, or usefulness, of any information, apparatus, or product or process disclosed herein or represents that its use will not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, name, manufacturer or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply endorsement, recommendation, or favoring of same by Westinghouse Savannah River Company or by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of the authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

Printed in the United States of America

Prepared For U.S. Department of Energy

Approvals	
W. D. Wilmorth, Words Processing Technology	7-29-05 Date
W. R. Wilmarth, Waste Processing Technology	Date
C. E. Duffey, Waste Processing Technology	7/27/05 Date
S. R. Loflin, SRNL QA	7(27(05 Date
E. J. Freed, LWD Engineering	0/3/05 Date
J. C Griffin, Marager, Waste Processing Technology	8/9/05 Date

Summary

This Plan describes the analysis of a sample of scale removed from the Gravity Drain Line of the 2H Evaporator. The analysis will support the development of a Nuclear Criticality Safety Analysis (NCSA) for evaporator operation and chemical cleaning. Previous chemical cleaning operations were performed using a nitric acid flowsheet that involved copious amounts of deplete uranyl nitrate used as a neutron poison. Current interest and focus is on a chemical cleaning operation involving only a sodium hydroxide solution. Therefore, testing will involve dissolving sub-samples of scale sample in sodium hydroxide solution at temperatures at 90 °C.

Introduction

The Savannah River Site (SRS) stores high level nuclear waste in 49 underground storage tanks. The wastes are to be vitrified in the Defense Waste Processing Facility (DWPF) for permanent disposal. The available tank space must be managed to ensure viability of the separation canyons to support nuclear material stabilization and continued operation of DWPF. Under normal operations, the wastes are evaporated to reduce volume. The SRS has three operational atmospheric-pressure high-level-waste evaporators. Two evaporators are located in H-Area and one is in F-Area. The 242-16H (or 2H) evaporator had not operated from October 1999 to September 2001 due to the presence of a large amount of sodium aluminosilicate scale that contained sodium diuranate. The scale is very similar to that observed in the aluminum and pulp paper industries and was produced at SRS by reaction of the aluminate supplied by the plutonium separations facilities and the silicate from recycle water from the DWPF. The chemistry of high level waste with elevated silicon levels thermodynamically favors the formation of aluminosilicates. The 2H Evaporator was scaled to the point that the concentrated evaporator bottoms could not be removed through normal steam lifting protocol.

Work performed by the Savannah River National Laboratory (SRNL) during calendar years 1998-2000 had shown that dilute nitric acid was an effective chemical cleaning agent. ^{8,9} An overall cleaning flowsheet was developed in calendar year 2000 that addressed numerous safety issues associated with cleaning the pot, neutralizing the uranium-bearing acid and discharging the neutralized solutions to a waste tank. Beginning in May 2001, a depleted uranium and nitric acid mixture was added to the 2H Evaporator pot and heated to elevated temperatures. As a result of this action, the pot was cleaned and returned to service.

As a result of the formation of aluminosilicates when elevated concentrations of silica are a concern, SRS changed the operational requirements for the site's High-Level Waste evaporators. Wastes containing high silicon concentrations, e.g., DWPF recycle, would be concentrated in the 2H Evaporator. The criticality hazard for the 2H Evaporator was reduced by depleting the U-235 content of the waste below acceptable levels. Waste containing aluminate would be processed in the 2F or 3H Evaporator and acceptance criteria were established to monitor for the possible formation of sodium aluminosilicate. ¹⁰

Routine inspections of the Evaporator pot have been performed bi-annually since the cleaning operations. In a recent inspection, evidence of scale growth has emerged. Additionally, difficulty in lifting the pot contents have been encountered along with a reduction in the pot

siphon flowrates indicated an obstruction in the Gravity Drain Line (GDL). Hydro-lancing operations removed solid deposits from the GDL and samples were retrieved. It is also anticipated that samples from the solid deposits in the 2H Evaporator pot will be retrieved for analysis. SRNL has been requested to analyze and perform dissolution testing on these samples.¹¹

Task Description

This work involves two tasks that are outlined below:

Task 1: Characterization of Evaporator Samples

Aliquots of the Evaporator samples will be submitted for solid state analysis by X-ray powder diffraction (XRD) and energy dispersive spectroscopy – scanning electron microscopy (EDS-SEM). The intent of these analyses is to determine the crystallographic solid phase and determine if discreet regions of uranium phases exist as in past samples.³ Aliquots will be digested using appropriate sample preparation methods and analyzed for metals by Inductively Coupled Plasma – Emission Spectroscopy (ICP-ES),¹² plutonium by alpha pulse height analysis using thenoyltrifluoroacetone (TTA) separation,¹³ and other radionuclides by either radiochemical counting techniques or Inductively Coupled Plasma – Mass Spectrometry (ICP-MS).¹⁴ Samples will be submitted independently in triplicate including at least one blank. Additionally, as part of their analysis, Analytical Development will include internal standards in each analysis run.

Task 2: Caustic Dissolution Studies

Initial characterization of solids removed from the GDL in 1997¹⁵ showed that caustic at elevated temperature (90 °C) would dissolve the sodium aluminosilicate at rates that could be used in the evaporator pot but were not sufficient for the GDL. Additionally, Dr. Addai-Mensah¹⁶ determined the solubility of a variety of sodium aluminosilicate phases in a number of process fluids. The kinetics of the GDL work and the Mensah solubility data indicate that caustic chemical cleaning is potentially a viable option. SRNL will perform dissolution studies of aliquots of the evaporator samples in a similar manner as used previously.¹⁵

Deliverables and Acceptance

The deliverables include written or oral reports (as requested) and one or more final reports incorporating the results. Reports will include a design check per WSRC Manual E7, procedure 2.60. The final reports will receive approval from selected Closure Business Unit personnel.

Responsibilities

Personnel in the Waste Processing Technology Section will:

• Plan and direct the task activities.

• Interpret and document results and conclusions.

Personnel in the Analytical Development Section will:

• Provide analytical services for the samples.

Personnel in the Shielded Cells Operation will:

 Perform tasks involving sampling and dissolving samples under the direction of Waste Processing Technology Personnel.

Documentation

All pertinent instructions, results and calculations will be recorded in a numbered notebook (WSRC-NB-yy-xxxx) in accordance with Manual L1, SRNL Procedures Manual, procedure 7.16.¹⁸ A laboratory notebook will provide lifetime storage as a record. Drafts of all preliminary reports will receive review by selected WPTS and LWDE for comments. Final reports will be issued after comment resolution.

Risk Review

Table 2 depicts the programmatic risks associated with this task and the associated mitigation, where identified.

Schedule

The schedule and costs are tracked and reported weekly during the SRTC and Closure Business Unit.

Safety

The author has completed the R & D safety checklist as described in the conduct of R & D Manual – Integrated Safety Management in the R&D Environment. ¹⁹ It is provided as Attachment 2 of this report.

Quality Assurance

Task Quality Assurance Checklist

See Attachment 1.

Table 2: Programmatic Risk and Mitigation

Risk Factor	Event	Mitigation
Equipment Balances Ovens	Failure	Backup ovens and balances are available.
Analytical Support	Failure of Instrument	Failure could result in short program delays.
Personnel	Illness Vacation	Primary and secondary researchers and analysts have been identified.
Facility Electrical Ventilation	Outage	Could result in short delays.
Experimental	NAS does not form	Repeat experiment requiring additional samples from Tank 49H

Conduct of Research and Development Checklist

See Attachment 2.

Documents Requiring Customer Approval

The following documents require customer approval:

- Task Technical and Task Quality Assurance Plan
- Final Report

Records

The following items shall be designated records for this experimental program:

- -Controlled laboratory notebook(s)
- -Final report
- -Supporting documentation as determined by the task leader.

Attachment 1. QA Checklist WPT TASK QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN CHECKLIST

Task Technical Plan No: <u>WSRC-RP-2005-01688</u> Task Title: <u>2005 Scale Analysis</u>
Listed below are the sections of WSRC QA Manual (1Q). Check the 1Q sections applicable to your task. Also, check procedures WPT implements to control the task. This checklist identifies controls for task activities performed by WPT only. **(Form Revised 5/25/2005)**

1.1 WSRC 1Q	Applies		Procedure
SECTION	To Task	1.1.1 Procedures Implemented by WPT	Used
Organization	X	1Q, QAP 1-1, Organization	
	X	L1, 1.02, SRTC Organization	
	37	10.04010.04	
OA Brownson	X X	1Q, QAP 1-2, Stop Work	
QA Program	Λ	1Q, QAP 2-1, Quality Assurance Program*	-
	X	1Q, QAP 2-2, Personnel Training & Qual.	
	X	L1, 1.32, SRTC Read and Sign/Briefing Program	
	X	1Q, QAP 2-3, Control of R&D Activities*	
	X	L1, 7.10, Control of Technical Work	
	X	L1, 7.16, Laboratory Notebooks and Logbooks	
		1Q, QAP 2-4, Auditor/Lead Auditor Qual. & Cert. 1Q, QAP 2-5, Qual. & Cert. of Independent Insp.	NA for WPT NA for WPT
		Personnel	NA IOI WPI
		- Croomer	-
		1Q, QAP 2-7 QA Program Req. for Analytical	
		Measurement Systems	
Design Control		1Q, QAP 3-1, Design Control	
		L1, 7.10, Control of Technical Work	
Procurement	X	1Q, QAP 4-1, Procurement Document Control	
Document Control	X	E7, 3.10, Determination of Quality Requirements for Procured Items	
Control		7B, 3E (for reference only)	
Instructions,	X	1Q, QAP 5-1, Instructions, Procedures, & Drawings	
Procedures		E7, 2.30, Drawings	
and Drawings	X	L1, 1.01, SRNL Procedure Administration	
Document Control	X	1Q, QAP 6-1, Document Control	
	X	1B, MRP 3.32, Document Control	
Control of Purchased Items	X	1Q, QAP 7-2, Control of Purchased Items & Services	
and Services		7B & 3E (for reference only)	
		The design reference only)	
		1Q, QAP 7-3, Com. Grade Item Dedication	
		E7, 3.46, Replacement Item Evaluation/Com-	
		mercial Grade Dedication	
Identification & Control of Items	X	1Q, QAP 8-1, ID and Control of Items*	
Control of		1Q, QAP 9-1, Control of Processes	NA for WPT
Processes		C, C - ,	NA for WPT
		1Q, QAP 9-2, Control of Nondestructive Exam.	
			NA for WPT
		1Q, QAP 9-3, Control of Welding & Other Joining Proc.	
		10 OAD 0 4 Worls Processes	
		1Q, QAP 9-4, Work Processes 1Y, 8.20, Work Control Procedure	
		11, 0.20, WOLK COLLIOI PLOCEGUIE	

Inspection		1Q, QAP 10-1, Inspection	
_		L1, 8.10, Inspection	NA for WPT
Test Control		1Q, QAP 11-1, Test Control (applies to WPT only for	
		acceptance testing; R&D test activities are controlled	
		by 1Q, QAP 2-3)	
Control of	X	1Q, QAP 12-1, Control of Measuring & Test Equipment	
Measuring & Test			
Equipment		1Q, QAP 12-2, Control of Installed Process	
		Instrumentation	
		1Q, QAP 12-3, Control & Calibration of Radiation	
		Monitoring Equipment	
Packaging,	X	1Q, QAP 13-1, Pkg., Handling, Ship. & Storage*	
Handling,			
Shipping &			
Storage			
Inspection, Test,		1Q, QAP 14-1, Inspection, Test, & Operating Status*	
and			
Operating Status			
Control of	X	1Q, QAP 15-1, Control of Nonconforming Items*	
Nonconforming			
Items & Activities			
Corrective Action	X	1Q, QAP 16-3 Corrective Action Program	
System	X	1.01, MP 5.35, Corrective Action Program	
QA Records	X	1Q, QAP 17-1, QA Records Management*	
	X	L1, 7.16, Laboratory Notebooks and Logbooks	
Audits	X	1Q, QAP 18-2, Surveillance	
		10.01740.0.017	
		1Q, QAP 18-3, QA External Audits	
		10 0AP 10 4 M	
		1Q, QAP 18-4, Management Assessment Program	
		12Q, Assessment Manual	
		10. OAD 18.6. Overlity Assurance Internal Audits	
		1Q, QAP 18-6, Quality Assurance Internal Audits	
		1Q, QAP 18-7, Quality Assurance Supplier Surveillance	
Quality	X	1Q, QAP 19-2, Quality Improvement*	
Improvement	Λ	19, Qm 19-2, Quanty improvement	
Software Quality		1Q, QAP 20-1, Software QA	
Assurance		L1, 8.20, Software Management & QA	
Environmental		1Q, QAP 21-1, Quality Assurance Requirements for	NA for WPT
QA		the Collection and Eval. of Environmental Data	14/1 101 WII
γγ		the Conection and Eval, of Environmental Data	

2.0 EXCEPTIONS/ADDITIONS-PROCEDURES IDENTIFIED ON THE CHECKLIST WITH AN ASTERISK (*) ARE SUPPLEMENTED BY A SRNL CLARIFICATION IN L1, 8.02, "SRTC QA PROGRAM CLARIFICATIONS". WSRC-IM-2002-00011, "TECHNICAL REPORT DESIGN CHECK GUIDELINES," WILL BE USED TO HELP ENSURE THE QUALITY AND CONSISTENCY OF THE TECHNICAL REVIEWER PROCESS FOR TECHNICAL REPORTS PRODUCED BY SRNL WASTE TREATMENT TECHNOLOGY.

Attachment 2. R&D Checklist

R&D Hazards Screening Checklist

Project/Task	2H Scale Sample Analysis		
Reviewer	W. R. Wilmarth	Date .	7/8/05
STEP 1. GENERAL	HAZARD SCREENING		
RADIOACTIVE MA	ATERIALS		
Does the activity inv	volve:		
A. Radioactiv	ve materials?	$\sqrt{\text{YES}}$	\square NO
B. Devices wi	th internal radioactive sources?	\square YES	√ NO
	If YES to either, then see Figures	6, 7, 8, 9, & 12.	
RADIATION-GENI	ERATING INSTRUMENTS AND	COMPONEN'	<u>ΓS</u>
Does the activity inv	volve:		
A. Lasers''		\square YES	√ NO
B. High inten	sity light, UV, IR, or near IR radi	ation? 🗆 YE	S √ NO
	nagnetic fields >600 Gauss?	\square YES	√ NO
D. Electroma	gnetic field generators?	\square YES	√NO
E. Microwav	e generators?	\square YES	√ NO
F. Electron g	uns or x-ray tubes?	\square YES	√NO
	If YES to any, then see Figures 8	& 12. 	
	ARDOUS MATERIALS		
Does the activity inv		,	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	oxidizing, or reducing agents?	√ YE	
	e or combustible substances?	□ YE	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
_	or pyrophoric substances?	□ Y E	· ·
D. Volatile so		□ YE	S √ NO
	If YES to any, see Figures 8, 9, 10	, & 12. 	
E. Toxic subs	stances?	\square YES	√ NO
F. Carcinoge	ns, mutagens, or teratogens?	\square YES	√ NO
(e.g., 1	ead, asbestos, beryllium, and silica)		
G. Biological		\square YES	√ NO
(e.g.,	microbes, viruses, bacteria, blood, o	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	If YES to any, then see Figures 8,	9, & 12.	
H. Cryogenio	substances?	□ YES	√ NO
. 0	If YES, then see Figures 8 & 12.		

HAZARDOUS ENERGIES Does the activity involve: √ NO A. Exposed electrical conductors at >50V? \sqcap YES If YES, then see Figure 13. **B.** Temperatures $<0^{\circ}$ C or $>40^{\circ}$ C? **√** YES \square NO (e.g., furnaces, ovens, dryers, heaters, steam, dewars, chillers) If YES, then see Figures 8, 10, & 12. ______ C. Compressed gas cylinders? √ NO \square YES √ NO D. Cryogenic gas cylinders? \square YES E. Potential pressure differences >15 psi? \square YES √ NO (e.g., heated or cooled sealed containers; chemical reactions; valve, regulator, or power failures; operator error; or fire scenerios) F. Systems under vacuum or at a pressure between 0 and 15 psig? \Box YES √ NO (e.g., drums, sealed glove boxes, and vessels w/ diam. >6"; system components not rated for pressure or designated for standard lab use such as glass bottles or plastic containers) If YES to any, then see Figures 5, 8, & 12. _____ **ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE** √ NO A. Is this a new activity? \square YES B. If NO, then does the modified activity involve a significant change in the: - Type or amount of materials (e.g., chemicals, samples, or simulants) currently handled or \square YES √ NO released? √ NO - Discharges of solids or liquids or gases? \square YES - Generation of hazardous, mixed, or rad waste? √ YES \square NO If YES to any, then see Figure 9. WORKSITE ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS Does the activity involve: √ NO A. Cold or heat stress conditions? \square YES B. Confined spaces, trenches, or excavations? \square YES √ NO C. Oxygen-deficient atmospheres (O2 < 19.5%) \sqcap YES √ NO D. Toxic atmospheres? \square YES √ NO (e.g., airborne contaminate conc. ? 50% of TLV, PEL, or other appropriate limit) E. High noise levels (>85 dB)? \square YES √ NO F. Exposed moving mechanical equipment? \square YES √ NO (e.g., belts, gears, rollers, pulleys, shafts, blades, springs)

G. Boating or work over water? If YES to any, then see Figures 8 & 10.	□ YES	√ NO	
H. Field work? (e.g., outdoor monitoring, installations, measurement or observations) If yes, then see Figures 8 & 11.	□ YES ents,	√ NO	
I. Flammable atmospheres (>10% of the LEL)? J. Open flames or sparks? If YES to any, then see Figures 8, 10, & 1.	☐ YES ☐ YES 2.		
K. Airborne mists, dusts, or vapors? If YES, then see Figures 8, 9, &10.	□ YES	√ NO	
L. Known or suspected hazardous waste site? If YES, then see Figures 7, 8, & 9.	□ YES	√ NO	
M. Gloveboxes or work in Shielded or Intermediate Ce If YES, then see Figure 4.			□ NC
N. Work performed in 773-A? If YES, then see Figure 6.	√YES		
O. Work performed in 774-A, 735-11A, 736-A, 749-A, Mobil Lab, 735-A, or 786-A? If YES, then see Figure 11.	□ YES	√ NO	
CP 2. HAZARD MITIGATION AND CONTROL A. Complete the supporting flowcharts for the hazards In Step 1. √ Co	s identified omplete		
B. If the activity involves the onsite transfer or offsite s hazardous substances (e.g., rad, flammable, corrosis or oxidizing material), Then contact the SRNL Transportation Co	ve, explosiv	ve, √NO	
C. If reportable or accountable quantities of special nu Or D2 are handled in any way, Then contact the SRNL MC&A MBA Cus	\square YES	erials √ NO	
D. If the activity involves the installation of experiment or systems, Then complete Figure 13.		quipment NO	

E. If the activity involves the modification of	the experiment	al R&D
equipment or systems,	\square YES	√ NO
[Note: Like-for-like replacement of compo a modification.] Then complete Figure 13.	onents is not co	nsidered
F. If the activity involves the maintenance of	experimental F	R&D
Equipment or systems,	\Box YES	√ NO
Then complete Figure 13.		
G. If the activity involves a pilot-scale process. Then complete Figure 14.	s. YES	√ NO
H. If a JHA has not been performed for the	tasks associated	l with this
Activity	\square YES	√ NO
Then complete Figure 15.		

References

1

- ⁹ C. S. Boley, M. C. Thompson, W. R. Wilmarth, K. G. Brown, "Technical Basis for the 242-16H Evaporator Cleaning Process (U)," WSRC-TR-2000-00211, Rev. 1, November 7, 2000. ¹⁰ W. R. Wilmarth, "Technical Requirements for Dispositioning Tank 40H Decants, SRT-LWP-2001-00032, Rev. 1, March 20, 2001.
- ¹¹ J. Jeffrey, "2H Scale Sample Analysis," HLE-TTR-2005-057, Rev. 0, April 28, 2005.
- ¹² Manual L16.1, Procedure ADS-1564, "Contained Inductively Coupled Plasma Emission Spectrometer for Radioactive Sample Analysis JY170C (U), Rev. 2, September 30, 2003.
- ¹³ Manual L16.1, Procedure ADS-2453, "Plutonium TTA Separation and Alpha Analysis," Rev. 2, December 14, 2002.
- ¹⁴ Manual L16.1, Procedure ADS-1553, "Inductively Coupled Plasma Mass Spectrometer Elemental and Isotopic Analysis for Aqueous Liquid Samples Fisions Plasmaquad PQS972 II (U) RADICPMS," Rev. 3, September 15, 2002.
- ¹⁵ W. R. Wilmarth, S. D. Fink, D. T. Hobbs, and M. S. Hay, "Characterization and Dissolution Studies of Samples from the 242-16H Evaporator Gravity Drain Line (U)," WSRC-TR-97-0326, Rev. 0, October 16, 1997.
- ¹⁶ J. Addai-Mensah, J. Li, M Zbik, S Rosencrance, "The Chemistry, Crystallization, Physiochemical Properties, and Behavior of Sodium Aluminosilicate Phases: Final Report," WSRC-MS-2002-00907, November 20, 2002.
- ¹⁷ "Design Verification and Checking," Manual E7, Procedure 2.6, Rev. 6, March 25, 2005.
- ¹⁸ Technical Notebook Use," Manual L1, Procedure 7.16, Rev. 2, April 16, 2003.
- ¹⁹ "Conduct of Research and Development Integrated Safety Management for the R&D Environment," WSRC-IM-97-0024, Rev. 3, October, 2004.

¹ W. R. Wilmarth, M. C. Thompson, C. J. Martino, V. H. Dukes, J. T. Mills, C. Boley, and B. L. Lewis, "Nitric Acid Cleaning of a Sodalite – Sodium Diuranate Scale in High Level Waste Evaporators," WSRC-MS-2001-00741, Rev. 0, October 4, 2001.

² W. R. Wilmarth, C. J. Coleman, J. C. Hart, and W. T. Boyce, "Characterization of Samples from the 242-16H Evaporator Wall," WSRC-TR-2000-00089, March 20, 2000

³ W. R. Wilmarth, C. J. Coleman, A. R. Jurgensen, W. M. Smith, J. C. Hart, W. T. Boyce, D. Missmer, and C. M. Conley, "Characterization and Dissolution Studies of Samples from the 242-16H Evaporator," WSRC-TR-2000-00038, Rev. 0, January 31, 2000.

⁴ Barnes, M. C.; Addai-Mensah, J.; Gerson, A. R. J., Crystal Growth, 200 (1999), 251-264.

⁵ Gasteiger, H. A.; Fredrick, W. J.; Streisel, R. C., J. Eng. Chem. Res., Vol 31, 1992, 1190.

⁶ Buhl, J.; Löns, J., J. Alloys and Compounds, 235 (1996), 41.

⁷ Kumada, N.; Wetrum, E. F.; Hemingway, B. S.; Zolotov, M. Y.; Semenov, Y. V.; Khodakovsky, I. L.; Anovitz, L. M., J. Chem. Thermodynamics, **1995**, 27, 1119.

⁸ W. R. Wilmarth, M. C. Thompson, C. J. Martino, V. H. Dukes, J. T. Mills, C. Boley, and B. L. Lewis, "Nitric Acid Cleaning of a Sodalite – Sodium Diuranate Scale in High Level Waste Evaporators," WSRC-MS-2001-00741, Rev. 0, October 4, 2001.